

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05440 01 OF 02 071926Z

42 12

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 ERDA-05 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDE-00 NRC-05 ERDE-00 EB-07 /095 W

----- 022515

O P 070950Z OCT 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3888

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 5440

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y - OMISSION IN PARA 6

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM NATO MBFR

SUBJ: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING SEPTEMBER 6

REF: A) USNATO 5241 DTG 251759Z SEP 75; B) USNATO 5118 \$5& 191415Z

SEP 75; C) USNATO 5387 DTG 031300Z OCT 75; D) STATE 230342

DTG 262137Z SEP 75; E) USNATO 5306 DTG 301500Z SEP 75;

F) STATE 221104 DTG 160011Z SEP 7

SUMMARY: AT SEPTEMBER 6 SPC MEETING, BELGIAN, FRG, AND UK REPS
MADE CLEAR THAT IF THE EAST RAISES THE QUESTION OF NON-US
EQUIPMENT LIMATIONS AT AN EARLY DATE, THEIR AUTHORITIES WANT
THE AHG TO BE ABLE TO RESPOND. UK INTRODUCED A REDRAFT OF THE PARA
IN THE POSITION PAPER ON "APPROPRIATE DEFINITION" OF THE COMMON
CEILING. THE DATA ON WHICH THE UK WANTS EASTERN AGREEMENT IN
PHASE I IS NOW FOR THE PHASE I STARTING POINTS, RATHER THAN FOR
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05440 01 OF 02 071926Z

THE POST PHASE I LEVELS.

ACTION REQUESTED: SEE PARA 11 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

1. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SAID HE WISHED TO REINTRODUCE THE IDEA OF INSERTING IN FRG REWRITE OF PARA 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE (REF A, PARA 4) THAT EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS COULD ONLY BE ON REDUCED EQUIPMENT. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID CANADA SUPPORTED THE PRESENT FRG REDRAFT OF PARAS 4 AND 5, WHICH THE SPC HAD APPROVED WITHOUT THAT PHRASE. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID FRG WAS SATISFIED WITH PARAS 4 AND 5. HOWEVER, HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVE THAT IF THE AHG IS ASKED EARLY IN THE DISCUSSION ABOUT NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, THE AHG SHOULD NOT EVADE THE QUESTION.

2. BELGIAN REP THEN ASKED ABOUT THE IDEA OF PLACING PARA 10 BEFORE PARA 6 (SEE TEXT OF DRAFT GUIDANCE IN REF B). FRG REP, WHO HAD PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED THIS, REPLIED THAT FRG NOW THOUGHT THIS MIGHT INDICATE THAT THE ALLIES WANT THE AHG TO RAISE THE CONTENT OF PARA 10 AT AN EARLY DATE, WHICH IS NOT THE CASE. UK REP (BAILES) SAID HER AUTHORITIES ALSO WOULD NOT WANT AHG TO REMAIN SILENT WHEN ASKED BY EAST ABOUT NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, REGARDLESS OF WHEN THE EAST RAISED THE QUESTION. SHE THOUGHT THE QUESTION MIGHT BEST BE ADDRESSED IN THE STRATEGY PAPER.

3. ITALIAN REP (CIARRAPICO) AGAIN PROPOSED DELETION OF THE TWO BRACKETED PHRASES ON MANPOWER LIMITATIONS IN PARA 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. US REP (MOORE) AND NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) POINTED OUT THAT THE SECOND BRACKETED PHRASE WAS INTENDED AS A COMPROMISE. WHICH THE HOPE THAT IT WOULD OFFER MEETING GROUND BETWEEN BELGIUM AND THE REST OF THE SPC. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT ONE OF THESE TWO PHRASES WAS INDISPENSIBLE FOR BELGIUM. HIS AUTHORITIES MIGHT BE MORE FAVORABLY DISPOSED TO THE SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE, IF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE WERE STRENGTHENED IN SOME WAY TO MAKE CLEAR THAT AHG COULD USE PARA 10 WHENEVER THE EAST RAISED THE QUESTION.

4. CANADIAN REP THOUGHT THE BEST SOLUTION WAS IN SOME REORDERING OF PARAGRAPHS. US REP NOTED THAT THE PRESENT PARAS 4 - 10 HAD BEEN VERY CAREFULLY NEGOTIATED AND ANY REORDERING WOULD OPEN A NUMBER OF ISSUES. UK REP AGREED, AND THOUGH THE BEST THE SPC COULD DO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05440 01 OF 02 071926Z

FOR NOW WAS A FOOTNOTE TO PARA 4, THAT THE USE OF THE PARAS ON CONSTRAINTS WOULD BE ADDRESSED IN A SEPARATE PAPER ON NEGOTIATING STRATEGY. BELGIAN REP SUGGESTED PREFACING PARA 10 BY THE PHRASE "AT ANY STAGE OF THE NEGOTIATION, IF THE EAST ASKS...". FRG REP THOUGHT THE UK IDEA DID NOT LEAD ANYWHERE, AND THAT THE BELGIAN PREFACE TO PARA 10 WOULD NOT CONVEY THE IDEA THA THE AHG SHOULD SEEK TO AVOID ENGAGING IN A DISCUSSION OF NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. THE AHG SHOULD FIRST HAVE MADE THE POINT THAT THEY WERE WILLING TO DISCUSS THESE QUESTIONS ONLY AFTER THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REDUCTIONS HAVE BEEN THOROUGHLY EXPLORED, PER PARA 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE.

5. ITALIAN REP ASKED BELGIAN REP IF HE COULD ACCEPT THE

SUGGESTION TO GIVE AHG FLEXIBILITY IN USE OF MANPOWER
LIMITATION ARGUMENT IN PARA 10 BY INSERTING "AS NECESSARY", AND
BELGIAN REP SAID HE COULD NOT.

6. UK REP INTRODUCED A COMPLETE REDRAFT OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT
POSITION PAPER, IN LIGHT OF NEW UK POSITION ON "APPROPRIATE DEFIN-
ITION" OF THE COMMON CEILING, TO REPLACE THE CHANGES WHICH UK HAD
PROPOSED AT PREVIOUS MEETING (PARA 5 REF C). SHE POINTED OUT
THAT THIS REDRAFT DIFFERED FROM THE UK POSITION AT THE LAST MEET-
ING, IN THAT IT WOULD REQUIRE EASTERN AGREEMENT IN PHASE
I ON DATA FOR THE PRE-REDUCTION FORCE LEVELS, RATHER THAN ON THE
POST-PHASE I FORCE LEVELS. BEGIN UK TEXT:

((IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP THE WORDS
"APPROPRIATELY DEFINED IN PHASE I" HAVE THE FOLLOWING
MEANING. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE AGREEMENT ON THE SCALE OF
REDUCTIONS NEEDED TO REACH THE COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING
THE ALLIES MUST FIRST SECURE AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST ON THE
EXISTING LEVELS OF GROUND (AND AIR) FORCE MANPOWER ON
BOTH SIDES. AN APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE COMMON COLLECTIVE
CEILING SHOULD CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS:-

(I) AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST IN PHASE I ON THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING ONCE PHASE II REDUCTIONS HAVE
BEEN IMPLEMENTED;

(II) AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST ON THE FIGURE FOR THAT
COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING. IN PRESENTING OPTION III WESTERN
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05440 01 OF 02 071926Z

PARTICIPANTS SHOULD DESCRIBE THE LEVEL OF THEIR COMMON
COLLECTIVE CEILING OBJECTIVE AS APPROXIMATELY 700,000
(900,000 MEN.))

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 05440 02 OF 02 071059Z

12
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 NSAE-00 NSCE-00 SSO-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 ERDA-05 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDE-00 NRC-05 ERDE-00 EB-07 /095 W

----- 017221

O P 070950Z OCT 75
FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 3889
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 5440

7. US REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES CONTINUED TO MAINTAIN THE POINTS WHICH HE MADE AT PREVIOUS MEETING WITH RESPECT TO THE UK PROPOSAL. HE ADDED THAT PRESENTING THE ELEMENTS IN THE UK PROPOSAL TO THE EAST AFTER OPTION III HAS BEEN TABLED WOULD BE VIEWED BY THE EAST AS THE IMPOSITION OF SIGNIFICANT ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR AGREEMENT. NETHERLANDS REP AGREED WITH THE LATTER POINT, AND SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES WERE TO MAKE THESE POINTS, AND HE WAS SURE HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD WANT THESE POINTS MADE, THEY WOULD HAVE TO DO SO AT THE OUTSET. BELGIAN REP SAID BELGIAN THINKING WAS IN THE SAME DIRECTION AS THAT OF THE DUTCH. HE THOUGHT THE AHG COULD PRESENT TO THE EAST THE NEED FOR AGREEMENT IN PHASE I ON A SPECIFIC FIGURE FOR THE COMMON CEILING, NOT AS A NEW REQUIREMENT BUT AS A SUPPLEMENTARY GUARANTEE FOR THE EAST, I.E., AS A CONCESSION TO THE OTHER SIDE.

8. US REP REPLIED THAT THE INTERVENTION OF THE DUTCH REP POINTED OUT A DILEMMA. DUTCH AGREED THAT IT WOULD NOT BE ADVISABLE TO LEVY NEW REQUIREMENTS ON THE EAST AFTER INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III. AND
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05440 02 OF 02 071059Z

YET THERE IS NO WAY THE ALLIES CAN LEVY THE REQUIREMENT OF AGREEMENT TO A SPECIFIC NUMBER IN INITIAL PRESENTATIONS, BECAUSE THE ALLIES ARE NOT YET IN A POSITION TO DECIDE WHAT THAT NUMBER WOULD BE. HE ALSO POINTED OUT, IN RESPONSE TO BELGIAN REP'S REMARKS, THAT THE PRESENT ALLIED POSITION ONLY ESTABLISHED THE REQUIREMENT FOR EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT, AND THIS WAS CLEAR TO THE EAST. NO MATTER HOW THE AHG PRESENTED A REQUIREMENT FOR EASTERN AGREEMENT IN PHASE I TO A FIGURE, THE EAST WOULD RECOGNIZE THIS AS A MAJOR NEW REQUIREMENT.

9. SPC THEN HAD BRIEF INITIAL DISCUSSION OF THE US AND FRG PAPERS ON PUBLIC PRESENTATION OF OPTION III. NETHERLANDS REP FIRST QUESTIONED THE NEED FOR SPC TO WORK ON PRESS GUIDANCE, AND THOUGHT THIS MIGHT BE LEFT TO AHG. FRG REP POINTED OUT PREVIOUS CASES WHERE PRESS GUIDANCE ON IMPORTANT MATTERS WAS WORKED OUT IN BRUSSELS. NETHERLANDS REP THEN ARGUED THAT THIS WAS LOW PRIORITY TASK, AND EARLY COMPLETION OF THE PAPER MIGHT ACTUALLY LEAD TO LEAKS. OTHER SPC MEMBERS STRESSED THE NEED TO HAVE SOMETHING READY FOR USE AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME. BELGIAN REP THOUGHT SOMETHING WOULD BE NECESSARY AT THE END OF ROUND PRESS CONFERENCE, BUT HE DID NOT THINK THE WHOLE OF THE PRESS GUIDANCE AND CONTINGENCY ARGUMENTS NEEDED TO BE USED ALL AT ONCE.

US REP SAID HE THOUGHT AHG WOULD TAKE SUCH FACTORS INTO CONSIDERATION IN MAKING ITS INITIAL JUDGMENT, FOR CONFIRMATION BY THE NAC, ON THE NEED FOR USE OF THE PRESS STATEMENT AND CONTINGENCY ARGUMENTS.

10. COMMENT: THE BELGIAN INTERVENTION, SECONDED BY FRG AND UK, HAS SERVED TO FOCUS SPC ATTENTION ON THE AHG RESPONSE TO EARLY EASTERN QUESTIONS ON NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT SPC NOW GENERALLY AGREES THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD AVOID RAISING THE QUESTION OF NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, AND ALSO NOW AGREES THAT ALLIES SHOULD SEEK TO AVOID BEING DRAWN INTO A PREMATURE DISCUSSION OF EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. NEVERTHELESS, IF THE EAST PRESSES AT AN EARLY STAGE RE NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, THE EUROPEANS DO WANT TO MAKE CLEAR THE ALLIES ARE NOT OFFERING NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. IT SEEMS TO US THAT THE DRAFT US PARA 3 ADD-ON (PARA 4, REF F) WOULD HELP MEET THIS SPECIFIC CONCERN. IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO CONCLUDE THE US-FRG BILATERAL DISCUSSIONS ON THIS SUBJECT AT AN EARLY DATE, SO THE US CAN INTRODUCE ITS DRAFT PARA 3 ADD-ON, BEFORE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05440 02 OF 02 071059Z

OTHER COUNTRIES BEGIN TO CLUTTER PARA 10 WITH ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF MEETING THEIR CONCERN.

1. ACTION REQUESTED: IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING OCTOBER 9:

A) EARLY GUIDANCE ON THE PARA 3 ADD-ON, IN VIEW OF COMMENT IN PRECEDING PARA.

B) THE US RATIONALE PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED IN PARA 11 B, REF E ON "WITHDRAWN BY THE US." STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 OCT 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO05440
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197510101/abbrzmjg.tel
Line Count: 252
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 5241 DTG 251759Z SEP 75; B) USNATO 5118 \$5& 191415Z SEP 75; C) USNATO 5387 DTG 031300Z OCT 75; D) STATE 230342 DTG 262137Z SEP 75; E) USNATO 5306 DTG 301500Z SEP 75; F) STATE 221104 DTG 160011Z SEP 7
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING SEPTEMBER 6
TAGS: PARM NATO MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006